

Wednesday, October 31st 1990

Today's Topics:

Gulf Breeze Report  
Gulf Breeze No. 2  
Gulf Breeze No. 3  
Gulf Breeze No 4  
Gulf Breeze No. 5  
Conclusion - Gulf Breeze  
Correction

---

From: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Gulf Breeze Report  
Date: 29 Oct 90 14:33:00 GMT

The following six messages are from an interview with Rex and Carol Salisbury conducted by Ray Griffin. It was uploaded to ParaNet for distribution. ParaNet will issue a statement in a short time after talking with the Salisbury's. Bear in mind that what is occurring does not prove that Gulf Breeze is a hoax, however it does provide us with a look at what is going on. ParaNet has always continued to rate Gulf Breeze as a probable hoax, and continues to do so. It is not our intention to continue looking at Gulf Breeze as we feel it is very unproductive. We wish to focus our efforts on cases which provide solid data for study and investigation such as the Belgium sightings.

\* THE PRESS RELEASE \*

Carol and Rex Salisbury  
State Section Directors for  
Pensacola MUFON

Interview, questions and answers bearing on recent investigation of the Walters' Case.

\*\*\*\*\*

We wish to release to the public a progress report on our work involving the reopening of the Walters' UFO case. First, two voice stress analyses have been made on a tape recording of the telephone conversation among Mayor Ed Gray, Chief Jerry Brown, Craig Meyers, Mark Curtis and Tommy Smith on 15 June 1990. These analyses both indicate that Tommy Smith was telling the truth in all respects regarding the allegations which he made concerning Mr. Walters and the UFO case. Second, we have investigated the writing on the model which Mr. Menzer found in the attic above his garage and have determined that the paper used in the model could not have been made from a house plan that Mr. Walters claims to have drawn in September 1989 for the Lynn Thomas family. This second point has been

independently verified by others including Mr. Phil Klass. Third, we have conducted analyses of Photos 14 and 19 in the Walters' book and have concluded that there is a very high probability that the reflections shown in these photos could not have been made by a hovering object as described by Mr. Walters and validated by Dr. Maccabee. It is a virtual impossibility for the reflections to have occurred as depicted in the photos. It is, however, very easy to have created these photos by using a small model and double exposure camera techniques as demonstrated by Mr. Mark Curtis of WEAR-TV. With Photos 14 & 19 shown to be probable fakes, scientific and intellectual integrity dictate that other photos depicting the same models should be considered as highly suspect. This includes the " Believer Bill ", the " Jane " and the so called " Tommy Smith " photos ( the voice stress analyses indicate that Tommy Smith did not take these photos).

Question: Are you making this disclosure on behalf of MUFON, or is MUFON intending to release your information through a press conference or other means?

Answer: We are providing this information of our own volition and are not speaking for MUFON. We don't know at this point what MUFON intends to do.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: Why are you making this disclosure without sanction of MUFON?

Answer: Over the past several weeks, many people have advised us of their opinions that MUFON will not acknowledge or release any information from our investigation which tends to disprove the Walters' case. WE have continued to believe in the objectivity of MUFON and believed that they would accept the results of our work at face value. However, in the past few days we have come to believe that others may be correct in their assessment of the situation.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: What has caused you to change your opinion in this regard?

Answer: We first provided Mr. Andrus, International Director of MUFON, with our preliminary analysis by telephone on 9 Sept, 1990. At that time we described for him a simple demonstration that he could perform to convince himself that we were correct. It was decided at the time to seek additional analysis from other experts to support our own work. We did this and sent Mr. Andrus an Interim Report on 23 Sept, 1990 which contained additional expert analysis confirming our conclusions. We talked with Mr. Andrus by telephone in late September and learned that he had not even done the simple demonstration that we had suggested to him. This tends to make us believe that he is not giving serious consideration to our analysis or the supporting analysis of other experts. Also, we have now learned that elements of MUFON are attempting to

discredit us as " debunkers " which we deem eminently unfair in consideration of the large amount of time and effort we have devoted to objective reassessment of this case.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: Can you describe the simple demonstration for us and could our readers do the demonstration for themselves?

Answer: Yes, it is very easy to do. It is basically a demonstration to show what the reflection in Photo 19 should look like when reflected from the flat road surface. The data to use can be taken from Dr. Maccabee's article in the 1988 MUFON Symposium Proceedings. These are as follows: distance from the camera to the object is 185 (+/- 5) feet; the diameter of the light ring at the bottom of the object is 7.5 feet; the height of the object above the road is about 3 feet; and the height of the camera is about 5 feet. You then set up a scale of 1 inch = 1 foot to do your demonstration. For example.... Cut a circle of white paper 7.5 inches in diameter, place the white circle on a flat surface and move away 185 inches to simulate the camera location, then raise your eye level to 5 inches above the elevation of the white circle, and you can see how the reflection should look. If you look at this photograph which we took of our own demonstration you can see that the reflection should appear as a narrow horizontal line and not as the much taller reflection as shown in Photo 19 of Walters' book. Walters' photo depicts the reflection as " hanging in mid air " instead of flat on the road as should be expected. It could be argued that the Walters' camera might have been higher than the 5 feet which we have used, but we have shown that the camera height would need to have been about 45 feet in the air to produce the reflection in Photo 19. If you will look at photo 19 in Walters' book, you can readily see that the higher elevation was not possible. Also, here is another photo which we took of our demonstration to show the results of the higher camera height, and you can see that the image of the reflection now approximates those in Walters' photos. This next photo shows the result if the road surface had been slanted up by about 14 degrees under the object. You can again see that this approximates the reflections in Walters' photos. The point here is that there is a strong indication that a small model and double exposure camera techniques were used by Walters' to take photos 14 and 19. There is strong support for this in the work done by Mark Curtis of WEAR TV. He made the same mistake in setting up his model which produces the same " impossible reflection " results as shown in Walters' photos.

Your readers can get an idea of what we are talking about here by observing the reflections of car headlights on the road as they drive at night, or by noting shadows on the ground in the early morning or late evening.

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Gulf Breeze No. 2  
Date: 29 Oct 90 14:53:00 GMT

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: You said that you have also done a mathematical analysis, what does this show.

Answer: Since the three-dimensional appearance of the purported reflection is converted to two dimensions on film, we calculated what that two-dimensional presentation to the camera should be. The horizontal component is essentially unchanged because of the geometry of the scene, but the vertical presentation is calculated by trigonometric relationships as shown here. You can see that the vertical dimension that the camera would see is about 2.5 inches. You can compare this to the measured and calculated value of 22.5 inches from photo 19 and readily see that vertical presentation to the camera in Walter's photos is roughly 9 times "taller" than it should be. This should present conclusive evidence that photo 19 was faked. The same conclusion can be made for photo 14 since it is essentially identical to photo 19 except for the geographic location and the use of different models. With these two photos shown to be fakes, all other photos which show the same model, should also be suspected of being fakes. This would include the "Believer Bill" and "Jane" photographs as well as the so called "Tommy Smith" photos. By the way, an independent analysis conducted of the purported "Smith" photos by a Ph.D. level photogramatrist indicates his conclusion that, "The sequence looks systematic and staged with a model at 6-9 feet." This tends to support Tommy Smith's allegations that Mr. Walters had taken those photographs of a model.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: What about the other experts which you claim have validated your conclusions?

Answer: We have had an analysis done by a local Analytical Physicist who holds a Masters Degree in Physics and does these types of analyses for his employer. He has constructed a rigorous mathematical model to show what the expected reflection should be under almost any set of conditions. When Maccabee's data, which I mentioned earlier, are substituted into this model the results are essentially equivalent to our own, i.e. that the reflections in Walters' photos 14 & 19 are about 9 times taller than they should be, which again

indicates that the reflections in Walters' photos are suspended in air and not off of the road or field as one would expect. The conclusions of this analyst are, " A direct measurement from photo 19 reveals that  $r=4$ . This is physically impossible, in view of the above analysis. Therefore photo 19 is a physically impossible representation of reality and is faked. The above analysis is rigorous and leaves no room for doubt. It assumes only cylindrical symmetry of light emissions with respect to the object axes of symmetry and the accuracy of Maccabees's calculations." (  $r$  in this conclusion refers to the aspect ratio of the horizontal divided by the vertical dimensions.)

We have another analysis done by a Ph.D. level photogrammatrist who is a friend. His results agree closely with those of ours which we demonstrated earlier. His conclusion is, " The reflection in Gulf Breeze photo 19 is inconsistent with the reported events." We will not use his analysis because of his need for anonymity.

We have also shared our work with Dr. Robert Nathan who is doing an independent analysis of his own at our request. He has expressed his agreement with our analysis and conclusions verbally over the telephone, but because of his busy schedule, he has not yet completed his own analysis.

We have also consulted with another Ph.D. level photogrammatrist who has done previous analyses of the Walters' photos. He has expressed verbal agreement with our analysis with the comment " I wish that I had thought of that aspect".

Arguments may be advanced that a non uniform illumination might be able to produce the reflections as shown in the photos 14 & 19. The experienced analysts mentioned before assure us that such non-uniform illumination should still produce an elliptical pattern for the reflection. However, the brightness of the reflection might be " spotty " ( i.e. brighter in some places and dimmer in others. ) Also, The diamond shape of the reflections in these two photos is not a normal expectation and is probably the result of error in planning how the reflection should look when the model was photographed for double exposure process.

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----

From: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Gulf Breeze No. 3  
Date: 29 Oct 90 15:06:00 GMT

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: Dr. Bruce Maccabee has done considerable work on these photos and seems to have concluded that they are real UFOs. Your analysis and conclusions seem to be in conflict with his. How do you explain that?

Answer: Numerous experts have applauded Dr. Maccabee on his analytical work, however, many of them have questioned his assumptions and his logic used in drawing his conclusions. For example, on page 145 of the 1988 MUFON Symposium Proceedings, Maccabee states " The reflection in the road below the object is unusual because of its shape and brilliance. It is not round, but more diamond shaped, indicating that the object was emanating a non-circular pattern. The reflection beneath the object in Photo 14 ( Figure 19 ) is also diamond shaped." Here he draws the conclusion that the circular source ( to which he admits on the same page ) made a diamond shaped reflection, which as an optical physicist, he should know to be impossible. He goes on to say " ( From a hoax point of view this is surprising because a model with a bulb inside would very probably give a circular illumination pattern.)" This sentence indicates that Maccabee assumed that one needed to put a bulb inside of the model to create a hoax. He conveniently ignored other hoax scenarios, such as the one used by Mark Curtis ( and probably by Mr. Walters ) wherein the shape of the " reflection" was designed into the model set up. Maccabee goes on to say " The brilliance of the reflection is also surprising, considering that it was reflecting off a (wet) road." We find it surprising that Dr. Maccabee did not address this incongruity in more detail since it is known that he and Mr. Charles Flannigan conducted experiments in this regard. When you consider that the surface of the road ( Black top) is highly absorptive, it should be obvious to even the casual observer that the intensity of the " reflection" is much too great when compared to the intensity of the source. We find it surprising that Dr. Maccabee did not address some of these important considerations which lead directly to conclusions that Photo 19 is a fake.

Another incongruity in Dr. Maccabee's work can be found in the last paragraph on page 169 of the 1988 MUFON Symposium Proceedings. In this paragraph, Dr. Maccabee explains the difficulties that Mr. Walters would have in photographing a model in Photos 36 L&R with the time elements involved and with witnesses nearby in the parking lot. He ignores the fact that Mr. Walters' wife, Frances, was with him and could have greatly reduced the difficulties. In fact, it would have been a rather simple process for two people as pointed out elsewhere by Maccabee in the article. Maccabee also fails to

report that Frances did not emerge from the bushes at the same time as Mr. Walters and had ample time to have hidden away the model and other paraphernalia involved. Other witnesses have confirmed that Frances did indeed remain concealed by the bushes for some period of time after Mr. Walters appeared with the photos. Dr. Maccabee has also asserted that rigorous procedures were used to record the numbers of the backs of the photos to track them and obviate the possibility of substitution. These assertions have been refuted by Mr. Charles Flannigan and the witnesses who were present at the time. None of the witnesses recorded the numbers!

The public may not be aware that Dr. Maccabee was paid for his work concerning the Walters' case. At this point, we have not been able to ascertain when he was paid, how much, who paid him, when he was paid, or what he was expected to do for the pay. With this in mind, we have excluded him from our investigation team to avoid accusations of bias in our results. Now, with our conclusions in conflict with those of Dr. Maccabee, we expect the accusations anyhow.

We understand that Dr. Maccabee and Mr. Robert Oechsler have done analyses on the so called " Tommy Smith " photos. We requested the results of their analyses as early as July, but neither shared them with us, which we find strange. Along the same line, many investigators around the country have shared their results with us, but we have not been able to reciprocate in kind because of our loyalties to MUFON.

We do not want this misconstrued as any kind of personal attack on Dr. Maccabee for that is not our intent. He has written and spoken profusely on this case and we simply disagree with many of his assumptions and conclusions.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: What have you determined about the model found in the Walters' former home?

Answer: We have statements in writing from the current owners of the home and we have interviewed them on several occasions. We, as well as other investigators, have determined that the house plan segment used to build the mid-section of the model could not have come from the plans which were drawn in September 1989 as claimed by Mr. Walters. Those plans specify that the exterior of the home to be " Sinergy " whereas the plans in the model specify a brick exterior. The address for the home to be built from the plans drawn by Mr. Walters in September 1989 would have been 700 Jamestown Dr. whereas the address on the plans in the model appears to be 712 Jamestown Dr. The residence at 712 Jamestown DR. was apparently built by Mr. Walters in early 1987. This represents a direct contradiction to the claims of Mr. Walters that he drew the plans found in the model in September 1989.

Mr. Walters has also publicly stated that the model was in

plain sight in the attic when Mr. Menzer found it. This is a contradiction to Mr. Menzer's statement in which he indicates that he did not notice the model until he moved a considerable amount of loose insulation aside. The question begs to be asked, " Did Walters have foreknowledge of the location and relative visibility of the model in the attic prior to its discovery by Mr. Menzer?"

If you look on the bottom of page 28 in Walters' book where he provides a description of the "UFO" that he saw: " There were also some diamond shapes between some of the large black squares and, unseen on the photos, there were definitely horizontal lines going around the main body. ( see drawing following page 64)". The drawings following page 64 do not show any horizontal lines except for the seams between the various sections. In the book, " photo 14, light-blasted and enhanced for detail, enlargement" show these same seams, so Walters could not have meant them when he described the horizontal lines. However, the model found in Menzer's attic have neatly drawn horizontal lines around the main body of the model, which is the only place that we can find the horizontal lines as described by Mr. Walters. This seems to indicate that Mr. Walters knows more about the model than he has admitted.

It is also noteworthy that 12 and 14 in Walters' book bear a marked resemblance to the model found in the Menzer's attic.

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
  
From: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Gulf Breeze No 4  
Date: 29 Oct 90 15:16:00 GMT

\*\*\*\*\*  
Question: What about the witnesses that have come forward and have claimed to have seen what Ed Walters has photographed?

Answer: We agree that a few witnesses came forward in late 1987 and in 1988, after they had seen the photos, and claimed to have seen a similar UFO. It is not our purpose to discredit those witnesses. We examined their case file reports and news accounts, and we have been able to interview most of them in person or over the phone. Under the conditions of observation (altitude, time of day, length of sighting, angle of view etc.) and general descriptions given, what they saw was similar in some cases but not an exact match to the Walters'



photos. For example, we interviewed Charles and Doris Sommerby recently. They said that the UFO that they saw in Nov. of 1987 was at least 150ft. across, had one row of round portholes with bright lights shining out of them, had a large lighted dome on the top that covered most of the top-half of the UFO, and it had a circle of smaller bright lights on the bottom. According to Dr. Maccabee's calculations the UFO that Mr. Walters photographed was only 12 to 25 ft across, had 2 rows of square portholes, had a small light on the top, and a solid ring of light on the bottom. Because they saw it on the same day that Walters reported photographing his UFO, they assumed it was the same. We have found that other witnesses did not see all the same details that are included in the photos, and because they made their report after they had seen a photo, a psychological principal known as "gestalt" may have influenced their report.

(The MUFON Investigators Manual cautions against contaminating the witnesses by showing them photographs of other sightings prior to their own independent description.) But it is also important to recognize that witness testimony is supportive, but does not prove the authenticity of the Walters' photos. These two issues must be separated in the final analysis.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: What about the lie detector tests that Mr. Walters claims that he has passed?

Answer: The Lie Detector Tests-- A misleading Issue.

In the Aug. 16, 1990, Gulf Breeze Sentinel, Ed Walters wrote an article entitled " Tommy Smith's Statements Questioned." In this article Ed writes: On June 19 I was challenged by Tommy's father to take a lie detector test. On that same evening I took the test and passed. Ed Walters has now taken 4 separate tests with three different examiners and passed them all. My wife Frances and Hank Boland were also tested previously."

In an interview with Ed and Frances in Sept. 1990 in which Charles Flannigan and the Salisberrys were present, we asked Frances if she had ever taken a lie detector test and she said, "No"

She explained that a taped interview had been tested by MUFON without their specific approval. Two tapes were submitted by Bob Oeschler to an examiner in Maryland. The examiner stated: " The way the interviews were done and the type of information discussed does not give the examiner the verbal material necessary for him to be able to say if these individuals are being completely truthful with the interviewer.

This examiner does find two areas in Mr. Hank's ( Hank Boland) interview that showed meaningful reaction which indicates a

problem with his answer. The answer he gives regarding the reason for the object disappearing when Ed saw (Hank). Mr. Hanks said that the craft communicates through Ed and can sense things through Ed. The other area is where he does not want to sign the form with his true name."

On June 19 Ed had himself tested with the Psychological Stress Evaluator, voice stress test by Robert Lauland in New Orleans. ( It is interesting to note that a test is only as good as its questions, or that the questions will determine the outcome, pass or fail) Here are a few of the questions that were asked: " Is it true that you did not kill a circular area of grass on the soccer field of G.B. High by using a trampoline?" A better question might have been, Did you tell Tommy Smith that you killed the grass with a trampoline? The real issue is whether or not he told Tommy certain things. ( see additional questions below)

In Feb., 1988 Mr. Charles Flannigan arranged to have Ed tested by a reputable examiner. Mr. Flannigan and other investigators created a list of questions that the examiner could use. Ed chose not to be tested under these supervised conditions. Instead he went by himself, on 2 occasions, to another polygrapher and paid for a polygraph. The questions that the investigators prepared were not used by the examiner, and no one from MUFON accompanied him to the testing site or observed the conditions of testing. This examiner stated that, " He (ED) claims to desire no personal gain or remuneration from these sightings. " ( However, Ed and Frances did have a book in preparation at this time and were actively seeking publication, which usually means money.)

It would be desirable for Ed, Frances, their son Danny, Hank Boland, and Tommy Smith to all take supervised polygraph tests to insure the validity of the results. So far the Smith family has agreed to these conditions if the Walters family would agree also. The Walters family has so far refused.

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109  
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name  
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
  
From: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)  
Subject: Gulf Breeze No. 5  
Date: 29 Oct 90 15:24:00 GMT

\*\*\*\*\*

Questions from Lauand voice stress analysis June 19, 1990 and observations on these questions:

1... Is it true that you did not make the UFO model that was found at 612 Silverthorn Drive in Gulf Breeze, Fl, ? Ans: Yes ( observation: Someone could have made the model for Ed, and he could be answering this question truthfully)

2... Is it true that you did not have a model of a UFO at 612 Silverthorn Dr. in Gulf Breeze, Fl. Ans: Yes. ( observation: If Ed had more than one model of UFOs at the house, this answer could be truthful but misleading.)

3... Is it true that you do not know who made the UFO model found on Silverthorn Drive in Gulf Breeze, Fl. Answer: Yes. (observation: The question has been skillfully juggled from the previous pattern by substituting ON for AT and omitting the house number. Ed could be answering truthfully in that the model was not found on the street, but inside the house.)

4... Is it true that you have never taken stereo camera photos of any airplane landing any time in your life? Answer: Yes. (observation: Ed could be answering this question truthfully since it is the wrong question, The question should have read, " Is it true That you told Tommy Smith that you went out and took a picture of an airplane landing at night, held the camera sideways, " since that was the allegation made by Tommy Smith)

5... Is it true that you did not kill a circular area of grass on the soccer field of Gulf Breeze High School by using a trampoline? Answer: (observation: again this is the wrong question. Tommy Smith's allegation was, " If I remember correctly, he told me that he turned a small trampoline upside down on it for a while and jumped up and down on it." Obviously the question does not address the allegation.

Mr. Lauand states in his opening paragraph, " ...and the questions were reworded for clarification..." (This gave Walters the opportunity to carefully word the questions so that he could answer truthfully without providing any meaningful results.)

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: What do you foresee will be the official MUFON position to your disclosure of this information?

Answer: We really don't know, but we feel that we have an obligation to share the results of our efforts with the citizens of Gulf Breeze and the Pensacola area. Remember that we too were believers of the Walters case and only changed our minds after the preponderance of evidence indicated that there was a hoax involved. We hope that MUFON will consider our evidence and support our conclusions. We sincerely hope that MUFON will continue to be an objective investigative agency of

the UFO phenomena.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: You probably know that Mr. Walters is running for the office of City Council member. What effect do you foresee that your disclosure will have on his campaign?

Answer: We are not residents of Gulf Breeze and hence have no interest in the elections of the city. Our timing on the release of this information is precipitated by the knowledge that some elements of MUFON are attempting to discredit us. We also would like to bring the investigation to a close because we have many important things to do that have been deferred because of our work on the case. We even gave up our usual summer vacation because of it.

\*\*\*\*\*

Question: Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Answer: Yes, we would like to repeat that the validity of the hundreds of other UFO related events which have been reported in the area is not affected by this disclosure and the outcome of the Walters case. We still remain students and investigators of the UFO phenomena and are grateful to the many witnesses who have shared their experience with us. We hope that they will continue to do so.

\*\*\*\*\*

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name

INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----  
From: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)

Subject: Conclusion - Gulf Breeze

Date: 29 Oct 90 15:34:00 GMT

\*\*\*\*\*

\*THE PRINTED NEWS ARTICLE\*

PENSACOLA NEWS JOURNAL

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1990

.....

INVESTIGATORS DOUBT UFO AUTHOR

BY CRAIG MYERS

NEWS JOURNAL

.....

Two investigators for the MUTUAL UFO Network said Friday they believe Gulf Breeze author Ed. Walters faked some of the

photos of UFOs that appear in his book.

" We believe that UFOs exist," said Rex and Carol Salisbury of Navarre of their study of several of Walter's photos. " We entered this investigation with a natural and favorable bias toward the Walter's case, " but " our investigation and analysis lend to the conclusion that several, if not all of the photos are probable hoaxes."

Walters, who co-wrote " The Gulf Breeze Sightings" with his wife Frances, maintains the photos are real and that they were taken during numerous encounters between November 1987 and March 1988.

Walters has appeared on numerous radio and television shows, including " Unsolved Mysteries " and the Oprah Winfrey Show, to recount his experiences with UFOs.

He was reported to be out of town Friday and could not be reached for comment.

In July the couple was named " Investigators of the Year " at a MUFON Symposium in Pensacola.

Walt Andrus, MUFON's international director, said Friday that his organization is not yet ready to give its stamp of approval to the Salisbury's four month investigation of the photos.

" I don't know how they arrived at that decision." Andrus said from his office in Sequin, Texas. " It is certainly premature. He has no business talking to reporters. It has never been cleared through here. He can't make representations for the organizations."

Andrus, who has for two years endorsed the Walters case, appointed Salisbury in July to take a second look at the case after questions surfaced about the credibility of Walter's photos.

The first question arose after a model was found in the Walter's former residence in Gulf Breeze in March. The Styrofoam and drafting paper model was found in the attic of the home and strongly resembled a drawing Walter's made of one of his UFO sightings.

The second question arose when Tommy Smith, formerly of Gulf Breeze, said in July that he witnessed Walter's fake UFO photos. Smith said Walters asked him to take some faked UFO photos to the Gulf Breeze newspaper and claim they were real.

But Andrus on Friday said Smith is lying and the UFO model was hidden in the attic by someone who wants to discredit Walters.

"Tommy Smith can't prove any of his statements- they are outlandish lies," Andrus said.

The Salisberrys said Smith's testimony and the model contributed to their conclusion, but more convincing was an analysis of Walter's so-called " road shot " that shows a UFO hovering over a road.

Salisbury said the reflection of the spacecraft, which should be flat, actually is at an angle that does not match the road's surface. The triangular shape of the reflection also does not match the round light source on the bottom of the craft, he said.

The Salisberrys said the photo and a second photo probably was created by a double-exposure-- a process by which a model is photographed and the image is exposed again onto the same frame of film.

" With these photos reassessed as probable hoaxes, the other photos... should be considered as highly suspect, " Salisbury wrote in the preliminary report.

Seven MUFON members investigated the sightings in 1988 and concluded Walter's story was true. The Salisberrys were not among the original investigators, but joined MUFON in November 1988.

Andrus said that while the Salisberrys are good investigators, they cannot yet speak for MUFON.

" They ( the Salisberrys ) do not have grounds to arrive at that conclusion until it is submitted to us. We will have to look at their facts," Andrus said.

The Salisberrys have not yet submitted their report to MUFON.

Phil Klass, a contributing editor to Aviation Week & Space Technology magazine and a longtime Walters critic, said Andrus is too " proud and stubborn " to accept the report.

" I think the Salisberrys should be commended for being willing to change their earlier opinion," said Klass.

But Dr. Bruce Maccabee, a photographic analyst who has defended Walter's photos. said the road reflection does not discredit the photo.

Maccabee said his analysis of the photo shows light from beneath the object was projected at an angle-like car headlights shining ahead of a car on a wet road.

Maccabee said Friday he still is open-minded about the Walter's sightings, but said it would take more convincing

evidence than Salisbury's report to convince him of a hoax.

" Nothing I have seen has changed my mind," Maccabee said.

Salisbury said his conclusion on Walters' photo does not shake his own belief in UFOs. And he said his report won't end the Walters' debate.

" The problem with Walters' story isn't a UFO problem, it is a human problem". Salisbury said. " If the Walters' case is typical of most UFO cases, the debate will probably go on for years in spite of any evidence pro or con."

[END]

File Name: GULFREP.UFO

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name

INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

-----

From: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)

Subject: Correction

Date: 30 Oct 90 08:00:00 GMT

I was informed that Ray Griffin did not actually conduct the interview with Rex Salisbury. He transcribed the material that Rex prepared in anticipation of questions that might be asked of him in his report.

Mike

--

Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User\_Name

INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

\*\*\*\*\*To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to\*\*\*\*\*  
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN	infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address	infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

\*\*\*\*\*The\*\*End\*\*of\*\*Info-ParaNet\*\*Newsletter\*\*\*\*\*

